LAWRENCE G. BROWN Acting United States Attorney MARLON COBAR Assistant U.S. Attorney 2500 Tulare Street Fresno, California 93721 Telephone: (559) 497-4000 5 6 7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 11 NO. 1: 08-CR-296-AWI UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, MEMORANDUM OF 13 PLEA AGREEMENT PURSUANT TO RULE Plaintiff, 11(c)(1)(B) OF THE 14 v. FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE 15 JEFFREY ALEXANDER Date: August 3, 2009 16 LASSOTOVITCH, Time: 9:00 a.m. Defendant. Place: Courtroom Two 17 Honorable Anthony W. Ishii 18 19 Pursuant to Rule 11(c)(1)(B) of the Federal Rules of Criminal 20 Procedure, the United States, by and through LAWRENCE G. BROWN, 21 Acting United States Attorney for the Eastern District of 22 California, and MARLON COBAR, Assistant United States Attorney, 23|| and the defendant, JEFFREY ALEXANDER LASSOTOVITCH, and his 24|| attorney, ERIC V. KERSTEN, have agreed as follows: 25|

11

11

//

26|

27

1. Charges.

The defendant acknowledges that he has been charged in an Indictment with a violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) and (b) (C), and 18 U.S.C. § 2 - Possession with the Intent to Distribute Gamma-Hydroxybutyric Acid ("GHB") and Aiding and Abetting.

2. Nature, Elements and Possible Defenses.

The defendant has read the charges against him contained in the Indictment, and the charges have been fully explained to him by his attorney. Further, the defendant fully understands the nature and elements of the crime which he has been charged with, together with the possible defenses and has discussed them with his attorney.

3. Agreements by the Defendant.

- (a) The defendant agrees that this plea agreement shall be filed with the Court and become a part of the record of this case.
- (b) The defendant agrees to enter a plea of guilty to the sole count of Indictment, which charges him with a violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) and (b) (C), and 18 U.S.C. § 2 Possession with the Intent to Distribute Gamma-Hydroxybutyric Acid ("GHB") and Aiding and Abetting.
- (c) The defendant stipulates and agrees that the facts set forth in the Factual Basis in paragraph 6 herein are accurate and that the drug quantity set forth in the Factual Basis is reasonably foreseeable and attributable to him in the course of the charged offense.
- (d) The defendant acknowledges that, should the Court fail to follow any or all of the Government's or defendant's

sentencing recommendations, the defendant will not be allowed to withdraw his plea.

- (e) The defendant agrees to pay a special assessment of \$100.00.
- (f) The defendant understands that the law gives him a right to appeal his conviction and sentence. The defendant waives any right to appeal his conviction and sentence and any right he may have to bring any other post-conviction attack on his conviction and sentence. He specifically agrees not to file a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 or § 2241 attacking his conviction and sentence.
- "Hyde Amendment," Section 617, P.L. 105-119 (Nov. 26, 1997), to recover attorneys' fees or other litigation expenses in connection with the investigation and prosecution of all charges in the above-captioned matter and of any related allegations (including without limitation any charges to be dismissed pursuant to this Agreement and any charges previously dismissed).
- (h) The defendant acknowledges that, as a consequence of his guilty plea in this case, he will become ineligible for (1) assistance under any State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act [42 U.S.C. § 601 et seq.], (2) ineligible for benefits under the food stamp program (as defined in section 3h of the Food Stamp Act) [7 U.S.C. § 2012(h)] and (3) ineligible for any State program carried out under the Food Stamp Act of 1977 [7 U.S.C. § 2011 et seq.]; all pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 862a. The defendant further acknowledges that as a consequence of his guilty plea in this case he may become permanently ineligible

for any or all Federal benefits.

(i) The defendant agrees that if he fails in any way to fulfill completely all of the obligations under this plea agreement, the defendant will assert no claim under the United States Constitution, any statute, Rule 410 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 11(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, or any other federal rule, that defendant's statements pursuant to this agreement, or any leads derived therefrom, should be suppressed or are inadmissible.

4. Agreements by the Government.

- (a) The government agrees to recommend a three or two-level reduction in the computation of the defendant's offense level, provided that he makes a full and clear demonstration of acceptance of responsibility under U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1.
- (c) The government agrees to recommend a sentence at the bottom of the applicable advisory Guideline range.
- (d) The government agrees to recommend a two-level reduction, provided that the defendant qualifies for application of the safety valve provision, pursuant to U.S.S.G. §§ 2D1.1(b)(9) and 5C1.2 and 18 U.S.C. § 3553(f)(1)-(5).
- (e) The government and the defendant agree to jointly recommend that an enhancement for "Abuse of Trust" under U.S.S.G. § 3B1.3 is inapplicable under the facts giving rise to this case.

5. Elements of the Offense.

(a) In order to establish the crime of Possession with the Intent to Distribute Gamma-Hydroxybutyric Acid ("GHB") and Aiding and Abetting, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) and (b) (C), and 18 U.S.C. § 2, the government must prove each of the

following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

- (i) That the defendant knowingly possessed Gamma-Hydroxybutyric Acid ("GHB");
- (ii) That the defendant possessed Gamma-Hydroxybutyric Acid ("GHB") with the intent to deliver it to another person;
- (iii) In addition, the government is required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that said possession with intent to distribute involved a mixture and substance containing a detectable amount of Gamma-Hydroxybutyric Acid ("GHB").

6. Factual Basis.

The defendant will plead guilty to the sole count of the Indictment, because he is in fact guilty of the essential elements of the crime set forth in the sole count of the Indictment. The defendant also agrees that the following are the facts of this case, although he acknowledges that, as to other facts, the parties may disagree:

On or about August 27, 2008, in the County of Fresno, State and Eastern District of California, and elsewhere, the defendant, JEFFREY ALEXANDER LASSOTOVITCH("defendant LASSOTOVITCH"), knowingly and intentionally possessed with the intent to distribute, and aided and abetted the possession with the intent to distribute, a mixture and substance containing a detectable amount of gamma-hydroxybutyric acid ("GHB"), a Schedule I controlled substance. Defendant LASSOTOVITCH knew that GHB was a controlled substance and that it was unlawful to possess it with the intent to distribute it.

More specifically, the following factual basis exists in this case:

On June 18, 2008 a team of U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agents executed a federal search warrant issued in the Northern District of California, at 370 Turk Street, Storage Unit 6-404, San Francisco, California. Pursuant to the execution of this search warrant, Agents discovered an operational, but inactive, Gamma Butyrolactone ("GBL") to Gamma-Hydroxybutyric Acid ("GHB") conversion clandestine laboratory. GBL is the chemical analogue to GHB. Also found within the storage unit were several plastic

containers containing various items to include GBL, GHB, as well as other items used to convert GBL to GHB.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

28

Following the discovery of the clandestine lab, DEA Special Agent (SA) Brian Keenan observed DEA chemists taking samples of the chemicals found within the lab. After completing the investigation at the lab, SA Keenan followed DEA policy and contacted PARC Environmental Construction, based out of Fresno, to clean up the clandestine lab. PARC Environmental had a standing contract with DEA for this type of clean-up work. PARC Environmental then responded to 370 Turk Street, San Francisco, SA Keenan was present at the lab when the following California. PARC Environmental employees arrived to clean up the lab: Jeff Davis, later identified as defendant LASSOTOVITCH, Louis Rodriguez, and Roy Holmes. These names were included on an invoice that was given to SA Keenan upon completion of the lab clean up.

SA Keenan later spoke to an employee of PARC Environmental, and was told that defendant LASSOTOVITCH was not authorized to participate in DEA-contracted lab clean ups, and therefore used the name Jeff Davis, an individual that was authorized to participate in DEA lab clean ups. Through further investigation, SA Keenan learned that Jeff Davis was not present at 370 Turk Street, San Francisco, California. SA Keenan eventually learned that defendant LASSOTOVITCH was, in fact, present at the lab. SA Keenan was then able to use California Department of Motor Vehicles records to retrieve a photograph of defendant LASSOTOVITCH associated with defendant LASSOTOVITCH's California Driver's License number and positively identify the individual using the name Jeff Davis, at the Turk Street lab, as defendant LASSOTOVITCH.

On August 27, 2008, at approximately 3:45 PM, agents from the Fresno Methamphetamine Task Force and DEA executed a federal search warrant at defendant LASSOTOVITCH's residence located at 5327 South Maple Avenue, Fresno, California, concerning GHB and GBL which DEA suspected defendant LASSOTOVITCH to have improperly taken from the Turk St. location on June 18, 2008. Pursuant to the execution of this search warrant, agents recovered approximately 12 gallons of GHB at defendant LASSOTOVITCH's residence. After agents secured the residence, DEA Group Supervisor Jeffery Sandberg read defendant LASSOTOVITCH his Miranda Rights, while witnessed by DEA SA Waleed Arabshahi. Defendant LASSOTOVITCH agreed to speak with agents and stated that he was aware that the chemicals were inside his residence. Defendant LASSOTOVITCH further stated that the chemicals were initially stored inside the garage of the residence, and then relocated inside the residence. In fact, defendant LASSOTOVITCH took possession of the said GHB from the 370 Turk Street, San Francisco, California lab and later unlawfully converted it to his possession by keeping it at his residence at 5327 South Maple Avenue, Fresno, California, in order to distribute it. Environmental records show that the only lab defendant LASSOTOVITCH was associated with in the San Bay Area where liquids

that were seized was the 370 Turk Street, San Francisco, California lab.

7. Potential Sentence.

The defendant understands that, in determining his sentence, the Court is required to take into consideration the Federal Sentencing Guidelines adopted by the United States Sentencing Commission. Further, he understands that the Court may give him any reasonable sentence above or below the applicable Guidelines range depending on aggravating or mitigating circumstances in his case. The following is the maximum potential sentence which the defendant faces for his conviction as to Count One:

(a) Imprisonment.

Mandatory Minimum: None.

Maximum: 20 years.

(b) Fine.

Two Z Maximum: Four Million (\$4,000,000.00) Dollars.

(c) Fine and/or Imprisonment.

(d) Supervised Release.

Mandatory Minimum: Five (8) years

Maximum: Life.

(Should the defendant violate the conditions of supervised release, he could be subject to a term of imprisonment up to the term of supervised release imposed.)

(e) Penalty Assessment.

Mandatory: One Hundred Dollars (\$100.00).

8. Waiver of Rights.

The defendant understands that by pleading guilty he surrenders certain rights, including the following:

- (a) If the defendant persisted in a plea of not guilty to the charges against him, he would have the right to a public and speedy trial. The trial could be a jury trial or a trial by a judge sitting without a jury. The defendant has a right to a jury trial. However, in order that the trial be conducted by the judge sitting without a jury, the defendant, the government, and the judge all must agree that the trial be conducted by the judge without a jury.
- (b) At trial, he would have the right to be assisted by an attorney, who would be appointed if necessary.
- (c) If the trial were a jury trial, the jury would be composed of twelve lay persons selected at random. The defendant and his attorney would have a say in who the jurors would be by removing prospective jurors for cause where actual bias or other disqualification is shown, or without cause by exercising peremptory challenges. The jury would have to agree unanimously before it could return a verdict of either guilty or not guilty. The jury would be instructed that the defendant is presumed innocent and that it could not convict him unless, after hearing all the evidence, it was persuaded of his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

28 //

- (d) If the trial were held before a judge without a jury, the judge would find the facts and determine, after hearing all the evidence, whether he was persuaded of the defendant's quilt beyond a reasonable doubt.
- (e) At a trial, whether by a jury or a judge, the government would be required to present its witnesses and other evidence against the defendant. The defendant would be able to confront those government witnesses and his attorney would be able to cross-examine them. In turn, the defendant could present witnesses and other evidence on his own behalf. If the witnesses for the defendant would not appear voluntarily, he could require their attendance through the subpoena power of the court.
- (f) At a trial, the defendant would have a privilege against self-incrimination so that he could decline to testify, and no inference of guilt could be drawn from this refusal to testify.
- (g) The defendant understands that by pleading guilty he is waiving all of the rights set forth above and the defendant's attorney has explained those rights to him and the consequences of his waiver of those rights.

9. Questions by Court.

The defendant understands that, if the Court questions him under oath on the record and in the presence of counsel about the offense to which he has pleaded guilty, his answers, if false, may later be used against him in a prosecution for perjury or false statement.

10. Entire Agreement.

The defendant and his attorney acknowledge that no threats, promises or representations have been made, nor agreements reached, other than those set forth in this Agreement, to induce the defendant to plead guilty.

11. Court Not a Party.

It is understood by the parties that the sentencing court is neither a party to nor bound by this agreement and the sentencing judge is free to impose the maximum penalties as set forth in paragraph 7.

12 //

13 //

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14 //

15 //

16||

17 //

1/

18

19 //

- II

20 //

21 //

| || ' '

22

23

24

25

 \parallel //

. 11

5 //

26|| //

27 //

12. Presentence Report.

The defendant understands that the United States Probation Office is not a party to this agreement and will make an independent investigation of the defendant's activities and his background and prepare a presentence report which it will submit to the court as its own sentencing recommendation. In addition, the Government will fully appraise the Probation Office, as well as the Court, of the full and true nature, scope and extent of the defendant's criminal activities concerning the charge to which the defendant is entering a plea of guilty.

DATED: 8/5/09

Respectfully submitted,

LAWRENCE G. BROWN Acting United States Attorney

By MARLON COBAR

Assistant U.S. Attorney

DATED: 8(3/09

JEFFRE KLEXANDER LASSOTOVITCH

DATED: 8/3/09

Attorney for the Defendant JEFFREY ALEXANDER LASSOTOVITCH